

CLASSIFICATION

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

INFORMATION FROM

FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS

REPORT

CD NO.

50X1-HUM

COUNTRY: URSR

USSR

DATE OF INFORMATION 1948

SUBJECT Scientific - Ideology

Scientific - Ideology

HOW

PUBLISHED Monthly periodical

DATE DIST. 27 Jun 1949

WHERE

PUBLISHED **Moscow**

NO. OF PAGES 12

DATE _____

PUBLISHED Sep 1948

SUPPLEMENT TO
REPORT NO.

LANGUAGE Russian

Russian

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50 U. S. C. 31 AND 32, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Vestnik Akademii Nauk, Vol XVIII, No 9, 1948.

MICROBIALISTS VERSUS FORMAL GENETICISTS
SPECIAL SESSION OF ACADEMY OF SCIENCES USSR, AUGUST 1948

Academician, S. I. YAVILOV, President of the Academy, opened the session with a short address pointing out serious deficiencies in the Division of Biological Science.

Academician Leon Abgarovich OGBELI, Academician-Secretary of this division, explained that the work of the division was by no means anti-Michurinist, and that LYSENKO's views in general enjoyed the support of the division's scientists. He repudiated insinuations that the work of the division had only a very small practical value, citing the importance of the work of Academician SIKHARIE in helminthology. The genesis and evolution of the dispute between formal and Michurinist geneticists were described, and the difficulties involved in arriving at a scientifically impartial decision were pointed out. He closed by saying that he ought to be dismissed for not having more resolutely opposed formal genetics.

Academician Alexander Lvovich OPARIN, Director, Institute of Biochemistry in Leningrad, spoke against idealistic tendencies and theories in the division.

Academician V. E. SUKACHEV, Director, Forestry Institute, spoke of the work of his institute, which includes a Laboratory of Evolutionary Ecology under Keller, a Laboratory of Genetics and Selection of Timber Trees, Director, Professor PRAVDIN, and which directs the work of the Central Scientific Research Institute of Forestry and of the Timber Technological Academy, both in Leningrad. In all of these establishments Michurinism was the accepted doctrine, and he personally had always been an enthusiastic Michurinist.

Sergei Vasilievich KAPTANOV, Minister of Higher Education, found GRENELI's speech thoroughly unsatisfactory, and accused GRENELI of harboring and supporting anti-Michurinists in the Division of Biological Sciences.

CLASSIFICATION

SECRET

STATE		NAVY		AIR		NSRB		DISTRIBUTION							
ARMY		AIR		FB:											

SECRET

50X1-HUM

I. E. GLUSHCHENKO, Doctor of Biological Science, LYSENKO's Institute of Genetics, similarly found OPBEL's explanations inadequate. He commented adversely on a number of Soviet geneticists, past and present (Appendix C).

Kh. S. KOSHTOYANTS, Associate Member Academy of Sciences USSR, spoke at length on achievements of pre-Revolution Russian physiologists, and in moderate terms praised the Michurinists and condemned the formal geneticists.

I. A. BENEDIKTOV, Union Ministry of Agriculture, attacked the Division of Biological Science for its impractical work, and for not introducing Michurinist principles. In particular, he condemned the work of: (a) the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology (former Director SEMAL'GAUZEN); (b) Institute of Plant Physiology; (c) Institute of Cytology, Histology, and Embryology, including Professor DUBININ's laboratory; (d) Soil Institute, in which the work of Doctors KOVDA and BOBE was particularly objectionable; and (e) the Publications Section, responsible for the journals, Doklady Akademii Nauk USSR, Izvestia Akademii Nauk USSR, Vestnik Akademii Nauk USSR, Journal of General Biology, Advances in Modern Biology, and Priroda.

Kh. F. KUSHNER, Doctor of Biological Science, spoke in favour of Michurinism and against the formal geneticists of the Biological Division.

Academician N. V. TSITSIN sent a letter, excusing his absence due to ill health, and explaining that he was always a staunch Michurinist.

G. V. KHRUSHCHOV, Doctor of Biological Science, director of the Institute of Cytology, Histology, and Embryology, explained that he was always a firm believer in the principles of Michurinism. He then gave a detailed account of how his institute became a nest of Mendelian-Morganism.

This institute was originally called the Institute of Experimental Biology, and its reactionary tendencies were discovered in 1939. As a result, the institute was reorganized in 1940, and given its present name, in the expectation that it would be concerned only with the noncontentious subjects named, and would no longer serve as a refuge for formal geneticists. Certain of its laboratories were abolished, such as that of the "Evolutionist Brigade," which was the stronghold of reaction. However, formal genetics soon again reared its ugly head, the moving spirit being DUBININ. World War II, the partial evacuation of the institute, and the death in 1945 of its Director, Academician ZAVARZIN, interrupted the work of purging and reorganizing the Institute. The former geneticists and their sympathizers were by then so firmly entrenched that they took very little notice of KHRUSHCHOV, the acting Director, but went over his head to the Secretary-General and the Presidium of the Academy. Their position was still further strengthened by the decision of the Presidium of the Academy to found a new institute of genetics and cytology, on the initiative of DUBININ and ZHEBRAY. As a result of the intrigues and lobbying of these individuals, chiefly of DUBININ and in spite of KHRUSHCHOV's opposition and protests, they succeeded in reinstating a number of their previously purged geneticist associates, such as Doctor ROMASHOV, Candidates in Biological Science, MEL'YAEVA and KHRUSTOVA in DUBININ's laboratory, in 1946-1947, and soon after Senior Scientific Assistant KILGOVENKII and Senior Scientific Assistant (PROKOTIYA-BRIGODNIKA) Director Professor MAVISEIN, Laboratory of Botanical Cytology, both transferred from the Institute of Genetics. To the same laboratory came Candidate in Biological Science KAKHLOZE without KHRUSHCHOV even being consulted, and these were followed by Senior Scientific Assistant MALINOVENKII, Laboratory of Cytogenetics, and at the end of 1947, by Scientific Assistant NOZKOVA, a geneticist. Whenever KHRUSHCHOV protested that he needed scientists to work in the physico-chemical laboratory, in the Laboratories of Cell and Tissue Study of Ontogenesis Izani Filatov, of histology and of karyology, not geneticists, he was told that such scientists were not available, and that these geneticists were only temporarily in his institute, pending organization of their

- 2 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

own institute. The whole fault thus lay squarely on the shoulders of the higher administrative bodies of the division and the Academy.

Academician N. A. MAKSIMOV, Director of the Institute of Plant Physiology since 1946, emphasized the admiration always felt by him and his co-workers for Michurinism. He admitted that there had been sharp differences of opinion between his laboratory and certain geneticists, in particular Associate Member, Academy of Sciences USSR, Docent AVAKYAN. This controversy appeared to have arisen over a misconception of the meaning of the term "plant growth substances," which AVAKYAN thought were metaphysical entities, somewhat like the "heredity substance" of the formal geneticists, whereas MAKSIMOV considers them as chemical substances.

He also admitted that his institute was at fault for adopting an impartial attitude toward the genetics controversy, which had now ended in the complete triumph of Michurinism. Other mistakes were in not cooperating with practical agriculturists, and in not sufficiently hindering Professor Mikhail Khristoforovich CHAILAKHIAN'S work on the hormonal basis of flowering of plants, which has been proceeding for over 10 years in the institute. As for Professor VASILIEV, also of Maksimov's Institute, he had 2 years ago given his solemn promise that he would no longer engage in any work which might cast doubt on LYSENKO'S theories and practical results, and MAKSIMOV had no reason to doubt that he had kept his word.

Nikolai Alexandrovich SKVORTSOV, Minister of State Farms, found ORBELI'S defense most unsatisfactory. It did not explain why such persons as DUBININ, ZHEBRAK, I. A. RAPPOPORT, ALIKHANIAN, DUSETEV, ASTAUROV, M. M. KAMSHILOV, and, above all, SEMAL'GAUZEN were so long tolerated and encouraged. Nor did it make clear why the Division of Biological Science adopted so negative an attitude toward Michurinism and Michurinists, citing the case of Comrade SILYANDER (Appendix B).

Academician E. N. PAVLOVSKY, Director of the Institute of Zoology, described the work of his institute, which employs 32 doctorants and aspirants, and mentioned the work of the fadzhik and Far Eastern Filials, pointing out the practical importance of their observations on tick-transmitted diseases of domestic animals. He proposed a number of minor reforms of the Academy.

Academician M. B. MITIN spoke at length on the life and achievements of MICHURIN, and condemned its opponents, as well as ORBELI for tolerating them.

Vladimir Petrovich BUSHINSKIY, Associate Member Academy of Sciences USSR, director of the Laboratory of Soil Biology (founded in 1944) described the attempts made by the Mendelians to have his Institute transferred to the Division of Geological-Geographical Sciences, which were frustrated by the intervention of Academicians ORBELI and SERIABIN. He was also continually harassed by a "Brigade," 300 strong, of pseudoscientists from the Soil Institute of the Academy, Geological-Geographical Division, who, making use of inside information obtained by trickery and through the agency of the "Spetsotdel" (NOTE: this term is usually applied to the MVD/MGB Section in charge of security of a given establishment), turned up in force whenever a paper from BUSHINSKIY'S laboratory was read, to subject it to withering and unfair criticism and ridicule. All this persecution arose, according to the speaker, because he and his school were staunch upholders of Williams' theories.

A. A. AVAKYAN, Associate Member Academy of Sciences USSR, took a highly sceptical view of the sincerity of the members of the Division of Biological Science who had declared themselves to be Michurinists of long

- 3 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

standing. Such "Michurinists" as KOSHTOYANTS, or even TSITSYN, were active or passive supporters of Morganism only a month before. *

The management of the Division had made four mistakes, they: (a) did not believe in Michurinism; (b) made no efforts to encourage Michurinists to publish in the Academy Journals; (c) did not attempt to use their authority to prevent the Morganists-Weissmanists from attacking Michurinists; and (d) did nothing to prevent infiltration of other departments of biology by Morganists, such as in animal physiology, plant physiology, microbiology, etc.

In his speech, AVAKYAN also attacked: Professor CHAILAKHYAN, for all the work he had done since 1932; Academician MAKSIMOV, for having said that AVAKYAN's work is 50 - 100 years behind the times, and for having said: "I would not be surprised to learn that AVAKYAN has never heard of ferments or enzymes"; SEMAL-GAUZEN, ZHEBRAK, DUBININ, ALIKHANYAN of Moscow State University, on familiar lines; and Associate Academician BARANOV, for criticizing a paper read by LYSENKO at the end of 1947.

Certain biologists, although not Michurinists, realized how wrong CHAILAKHYAN was. These were Professors GENKEL, RAJNER, NICHIPOROVICH, and VASILIEV.

Academician G. F. ALEKSANDROV of the Institute of Philosophy, Academy of Sciences USSR, explained at considerable length how pro-Michurinist he and his institute had always been. He thought it was a bad thing that, of all the educational establishments in the USSR, only the Academy of Sciences USSR did not include Marxist-Leninist philosophy as a compulsory subject of study for aspirants.

Academician B. B. POLYNOV, Director of the Soil Institute imeni V. V. DOKUCHAYEV defended his institute against the attacks made by BENEDIKTOV and BUSHINSKIY. He admitted that 6 weeks earlier he would not have taken such remarks seriously, since the institute had, on the whole, done good and useful work. He now felt differently, and thought that it was not enough to be unresponsive to the teachings of Williams; they should have actively furthered these teachings. He agreed with BENEDIKTOV'S and BUSHINSKIY'S views on the pernicious tendencies expounded by RODE, but disagreed emphatically with BUSHINSKIY'S other remarks.

Associate Member of the Academy of Sciences USSR, N. I. GRASHCHENKOV, expressed his gratitude to STALIN and the Central Committee of the Communist Party for having intervened on behalf of the Michurinists. He personally had always been a staunch supporter of this school of thought. He then condemned the work and publications of Professors DUBININ, SEMAL-GAUZEN, BLYAKHER, KHALATOV, KARLIK, DAVIDENKOV, KOLTSOV, and ZHEBRAK, all of whom are tainted with Morgan-Mendel-Weissman principles.

Academician N. G. BRUYEVICH, Academician-Secretary of the Academy of Sciences USSR, repeated what previous speakers had said against the Division of Biological Sciences, and complained of a lack of discipline among the Academicians. There could be no excuses for noncompliance with orders coming from the Presidium of the Academy.

N. I. HUZHDIN, Doctor of Biological Science, quoted the works of various foreign geneticists, such as MATHER, HARLAND, MELLER, and CASTLE, which seemed to support LYSENKO'S views. He scoured the Soviet formal geneticists of being more orthodox in their reactionary attitude to genetics than are even their Western counterparts.

- 4 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

Academician I. A. OSEBIL made a second speech, in which he admitted the validity of most of the criticisms levelled against his first speech, explained more fully how it was that some of the errors had been committed, disclaimed any personal responsibility for certain of them (SIMAL'GAUZEN'S Stalin Prize, Appendix A), and justified his action in others (SILYANDER, Appendix B).

Academician I. E. PREZENT expressed his views on the SILYANDER case (Appendix B).

Academician S. I. VAVILOV said, in summing up, that the Biological Division was the biggest division of the Academy, comprising 13 institutes, 7 research stations, 6 laboratories, 6 commissions, and 4 learned societies, not to mention numerous filials and research bases. The proceedings of the session had established that this important division had not been properly directed. Certain emergency measures had been taken, subject to future confirmation by the Academy (Appendix D).

Academician L. D. SHEVYAKOV pleaded for the inclusion in the new program of provision for the study of "productive potential" (VAVILOV agreed).

V. P. LAMINSKIY wanted the resolution to be so worded as to make it clear that the Presidium of the Academy had persisted in its mistaken policies despite the advice of Gosplan. (VAVILOV did not agree).

Academician A. D. SPERANSKIY suggested that reference to the participation of the Academy of Medical Sciences in the projected planning meeting of the Academy should be deferred, until the Academy of Medical Sciences had met and put its own house in order. (VAVILOV did not agree).

Academician K. I. SKRYABIN said that there had been much justified criticism of the Division of Biological Science on the grounds that they had produced only very few results of practical value to Soviet livestock production. "This is understandable, however, in view of the fact that there was virtually none on the staff who had any knowledge of the problems involved. Could not an instruction requiring the elaboration of appropriate measures to remedy this deficiency be included in the resolution?"

VAVILOV thought not, as the trouble was due to lack of material facilities, and not to lack of experts. There being no further speakers, he closed the proceedings, as follows:

"Comrades! Before we disperse after these important discussions and decisions, we cannot but think of that man, whose eagle eye and whose genius correct our mistakes in all fields -- political, economic, and scientific. I refer, Comrades, to Joseph Vissarionovich STALIN! (thunderous applause. All rise from their seats). Comrades, it has been moved that we conclude our session by accepting the text of our personal message to Comrade Stalin (thunderous applause).

"The text will be read by Academician PAVLOVSKIY (to the accompaniment of the applause of the entire audience Academician E. N. PAVLOVSKIY reads the text).

"Allow me, Comrades, to assume that your friendly applause signifies your approval of the text.

"Long live Comrade Stalin!" (thunderous, long-continued applause, developing into an ovation in honor of Comrade Stalin).

- 5 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

A number of scientists submitted written messages to the session:

Doctor of Biological Sciences I. M. VASIL'YEV claimed always to have been a Michurinist. He confessed to two serious deviations, however, he had: (a) in some of his papers, disagreed with views expressed by LYSENKO as to the theory and practice of vernalization wheat; and (b) in his writings overemphasized the importance of LYSENKO'S predecessors.

He assured the Session that he would in future be a faithful soldier of the Soviet Michurinist Army, under the command of LYSENKO.

Candidate of Biological Sciences R. L. DOZORTSEVA, of the Bureau of the Division of Biological Sciences gave an account of the long struggle for Michurinism. In 1939, Academicians A. N. BAKH, B. A. KEHLER, and others denounced the activities of Professor KOLISOV'S Institute of Experimental Biology, leading to its reorganization in 1940. The Institute of Genetics was similarly reorganized, but the Morganist-Mendelists continued their anti-Michurinist activities. Examples were:

1. Professor ZHEBRAK'S intrigues toward establishment of an independent institute of genetics.
2. They spread the story that the staff of the Leningrad All-Union Institute of Plant Breeding had eaten their world-famous seed collection during the siege; this lying story was repeated by HUXLEY in Nature.
3. They spread the story that LYSENKO was no scientist, but only a farmer. ZHEBRAK wrote in his article in Science that LYSENKO was not even a geneticist.
4. They systematically suppressed all reference to Michurinism, and in particular to Lyenko'S achievements, in the scientific press.
5. They called for deletion of reference to the work of the Institute of Genetics on vegetative hybridization from an Academy report of achievements during 1946, on the grounds that it was not sufficiently established.
6. They attempted to create the impression that they were being persecuted and suppressed by LYSENKO, although even Huxley denied this, giving as an example that the non-Michurinists IVIN, PROKOF'EVA-BELGOVSKAYA, and BELGOVSKIY were employed in LYSENKO'S Institute. As soon as they heard of Huxley's statement, however, the Belgovskiy's announced that they were leaving the institute.

She concluded with a recommendation that anti-Michurinists should be sought out and eliminated from all of the establishments of the Biological Sciences Division. As for Comrade BUSHINSKIY, he had been for 3 - 4 years Deputy Academician-Secretary to the division, and a member of its Bureau, but the only differences of opinion between him and the other members related to "financial discipline," not to Michurinism.

Academician B. L. ISACHENKO Director of the Institute of Microbiology, Academy of Sciences USSR, stressed the importance of Michurinism to microbiology.

V. A. KOVDA, Doctor of Geological-Mineralogical Sciences, of the Soil Institute, (see above) claimed to be a staunch adherent of the Michurin-Dokuchaev-Williams school of soil science. He admitted that the institute had tolerated deviations from the teachings of this school, and named Professor RODE as the ringleader of the deviationists.

- 6 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

Doctor of Biological Sciences, A. A. NICHIPOROVICH, Deputy Director, Institute of Plant Physiology, found that his institute was to blame for not adhering firmly to the principles of Michurinism, for tolerating the anti-Michurinist researches of Professor CHALLAKYAN, and for engaging the staff with such mistaken views as had Professor I. M. VASIL'YEV and L. P. BRESLAVETS.

Doctor of Biological Sciences, N. M. SISAKYAN, of the Institute of Biochemistry, exposed the errors contained in SCHROEDINGER'S and BIDDLE'S monographs, and regretted that certain Soviet biologists supported these false and harmful teachings, viz., Academician Ya. O. PARNAS and N. P. DUBININ.

Academician K. I. SKRYABIN called for a closer tie-up of the division with the problems of livestock production.

Doctor of Biological Sciences, A. N. STUDNITSKIY, of the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology imeni SEVERTSOV, explained how it was that the workers of this Institute had been deluded into believing that Academician SEMAL'GAUZEN'S work was a continuation of that of SEVERTSOV; in reality, it had by gradual, almost imperceptible stages, moved in the direction of formal genetics.

APPENDIX A

S. V. KAFTANOV (p 53)

Many of the more important posts of the division were entrusted to followers of Mendel and Morgan. Thus, the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology was for many years directed by SEMAL'GAUZEN, a bitter opponent of Michurinism, and a champion of Mendelian-Weissmanist teachings in biology. Academician SEMAL'GAUZEN'S activities have been most detrimental both to the Institute of Morphology and to the teaching of the biological sciences in higher educational establishments, inasmuch as he was for many years Professor of Darwinism at Moscow University. The session of the Academy of Agricultural Sciences denounced these activities as being Mendelian-Morganist, and fundamentally opposed to the Michurinist movement. It is not clear why Academician ORBELI has never mentioned this circumstance, and has never even commented on SEMAL'GAUZEN'S activities. Can this not be because Academician ORBELI has on two occasions submitted Academician SEMAL'GAUZEN'S scientific papers for a Stalin Prize? Did we not hear in Academician ORBELI'S address of the activities of such Morganists-Mendelians as DUBININ, ZHEBRUK, SABININ, and NAVASHIN?

Academician L. A. ORBELI (p 165)

Now about some questions put forward by Comrade KAFTANOV, who asks me why I did not stop to consider SEMAL'GAUZEN'S activity or the question of recommendation of his work for the prizes? I will give a short answer.

It is a well-known fact that two expert commissions are in existence, attached to the Committee for Stalin Prizes. These commissions consist of quite a number of people. The expert commission, headed by me, consisted of 12 members. This commission examined numerous scientific papers, and each paper was given to three, four, five and sometimes six examiners. I had five favourable reports on SEMAL'GAUZEN'S work. After reading those reports, one of the members of the expert commission, a chemist by profession, asked for permission to speak, and, at the next meeting, made a

- 7 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

very adverse report. Further, it is a known fact that all materials collected by the expert commission have first to be agreed upon by the Chairman or his deputy, and after that have to be examined by the Plenum. That this procedure was followed is also known. The chairman of the expert commission is not the only judge who dictates his decisions to the commission and then enforces them. The chairman is only a chairman, and if, after having five favourable and one adverse opinion, and when 11 of the 12 members of the expert commission vote "For" and only one "against," his duty is to report accordingly to the Presidium and Plenum of the Committee, and this was done. I simply cannot understand why this question was raised and where I am at fault. I do not see how I can be blamed. I simply report the proceedings of the commission under my chairmanship."

APPENDIX B

N. A. SKVORTSOV (P 103)

"I want to mention one of these facts, i. e., the attitude of the Physiological Institute imeni Pavlov toward the study of the subject: "The effect of environmental conditions of domestic animals on their growth and milk output," which was put forward as a result of experience gained in the Karavayev State Farm. In 1947, the scientific council of this institute acknowledged the theoretical and practical importance of this subject, and approved the necessity of its study. And yet, after one year, the attitude of the institute was abruptly changed. On the pretext that the work on this subject, which was carried out by Comrade SIL'YANDER, does not properly fall within the scope of the work of the institute, that he made no attempt to investigate the physiological nature of the problem, that he did not appear to have the necessary basic training, and that he made no attempt to apply physiological methods, as would be expected of a candidate for a doctor's degree in physiology, the scientific council, under Academician ORRELI, decided to remove him from the institute and to direct him into another scientific establishment, having a closer connection with zootechnics.

I will not here enter into the question of whether Comrade SIL'YANDER was or was not competent, in view of his scientific training, to investigate this problem. I am interested in a different aspect of this question, viz., why did the Institute, having at its disposal a special department of physiology of domestic animals, not consider it necessary to pursue this investigation, which was obviously of considerable importance to state and collective farms? We ask Academician ORRELI, was it not possible, having such a number of qualified scientists at the disposal of the institute, to conclude this research successfully, and so to solve one of the essential problems of livestock rearing? I cannot understand why the best solution for this problem was to request the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences to transfer Comrade SIL'YANDER, together with his work, to the Institute of Genetics, i. e., to Academician LYSENKO? Was it not because it is the opinion of some scientists, that questions relating to the practical needs of agriculture, are the business of LYSENKO only?...."

- 8 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

Academician ORBELI (p 167)

"Permit me to make two important statements. The first refers to the subject raised by Comrade SKVORISOV, i.e., the expulsion of Doctorant SIL'YANDER from our institute. This was attributed to his pro-Michurin beliefs and to my alleged anti-Michurin tendency. Of course, nothing of the sort has happened. Comrade SIL'YANDER arrived at our institute to study the effects of low temperature on milk and wool production and, mainly, on the rate of growth of animals. Though this subject was outside our field of activity, we accepted him and gave him the maximum of help. In spite of the difficult conditions prevailing in our small laboratory, he was supplied with goats and rabbits. During the first year he raised kids, and carried out a certain part of the research. His work was approved by our scientific council as essential, interesting and useful but, at the same time, we pointed out to him, that it is quite inadmissible for a person working on a doctor of biology thesis, to be satisfied only with weighing rabbits before and after feeding and recording their rate of growth, especially when he is attached to a physiological establishment and should apply more accurate physiological methods to the elucidation of the subject. He was given appropriate instructions and advice. He was taught methods of research and was supplied with apparatus. Nevertheless, he rejected all advice, telling his advisers, that he is not a mere aspirant, but a doctorant, and therefore does not need advice and does not want to carry out instructions. After 12 months, at the next report meeting of the scientific council, he made a report, which disclosed his complete ignorance. For the biologists, who are present here, it will be quite evident, that when a man has arrived at definite conclusions, and remarks that he found a respiratory quotient of 75, and, when an attempt is made to help him and to explain to him that he has probably made a mistake, he begins to argue and tries to prove that he is right, it could not but raise doubt of the accuracy of his experimental data and of his physiological knowledge in general. On this account two commissions were appointed which were to examine thoroughly his whole activity, beginning with his laboratory records and ending with his concluding articles and with the way he presented his results. These commissions, which were composed of absolutely disinterested and very competent people, found that his work showed his complete ignorance of the subject. Ignoring all instructions given him, he would in determining gaseous metabolism, grab the goats by their forelegs, force the respirator on them and perform measurements of basal metabolism while they were struggling. The whole work proved to be defective, but he would not listen to advice or instructions.

"At the same session of the council I tried to save him and to help him. I, as a chairman, gave him definite instructions and advised him what to do to get out of the false position he was in, and to get onto the firm ground of true scientific work. But, in his answering speech, he made such remarks to me and expressed such views, that it was quite evident, that he did not want to listen to advice, but insisted on following his own council. After that he went over to the University and tried to get help from Professor PREZENT. I do not know if Professor PREZENT helped him, but SIL'YANDER used to say to us: 'You wait, PREZENT will take up this question; I will deal with you yet!' I hope that Professor PREZENT will examine this question objectively, and will find out that it has nothing to do with a Michurinite or a Lysenkovite joining us, and with the anti-Michurinists persecuting him, but that we could not continue to work with a man who is ignorant, and who obstinately refuses to pay any attention to his advisers. Furthermore, information was received about him which has been examined by the district party organization, which expelled him from the party as an unworthy person..."

- 9 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

I. I. PREZENT (p. 171)

"Unfortunately, it is not possible for me either to agree or disagree with Academician ORBELI about the literacy or illiteracy of the remarks made by his doctorant, Comrade SIL'YANDER. Though I have tried to take part in these meetings, where I could have gotten acquainted with his spoken reports, in the conditions prevailing in the institute under ORBELI'S directorship, my efforts were in vain. I was refused this possibility, and I was told that my presence was undesirable. However, I have some objective facts which allow me to doubt the ignorance shown toward the respiratory and other quotients, which were reported here by Academician ORBELI.

"Doctorant SIL'YANDER submitted two very good papers to the leading and guiding journal of the Michurin theory, Agro-biology. They were presented by Academician ORBELI; they were not repudiated by anyone, nor by this Chair either. The problems which SIL'YANDER'S work was to elucidate are very important and necessary, and when the Scientific Council makes the decision that there is no room for it in the Physiological Institute, as it does not conform to their program of work (Academician ORBELI: 'This is not the Institute's formulation'), I have this formulation and it is just as I stated it. It speaks so much for itself that one begins to be suspicious of the alleged gross inexperience and unwillingness of SIL'YANDER to listen to anyone. Those accusations have to be looked upon with doubt. There is no doubt that the Physiological Institute was unwilling to work on this subject as not being in conformity with the research program of the Institute's Agricultural Department. There is no doubt that SIL'YANDER was removed from the Laboratory for this reason. It is also a fact that, from 1 September, the experimental materials (twins, which are important and valuable irrespective of this particular research) are to be transferred to your animal farm at the State Farm. Is this known to you, Academician ORBELI? (Academician ORBELI: 'I will give a full answer immediately').

"I think that, perhaps, Academician ORBELI made this mistake not on his own initiative, but because he was influenced to a great degree by his subordinates, who gave him a wrong idea of SIL'YANDER'S work. I think that the cause here may be the same as the one which led to your writing a mistaken foreword to DAVIDENKOV'S book, i. e., insufficient attention and not enough interest in the work which you supervise. I have a reason for this statement, as DAVIDENKOV'S case is not the only one. Allow me to remind you (and I am doing it for objectivity's sake and certainly for the good of the work) that such a work as that of KRYSHEV was produced in the Institute with which you are connected. This work on the inheritance of dreams was published in the journal General Biology. The work is deeply Freudian and has a leaning toward the Swiss school of Freudism i. e., the most reactionary school, and it was published in a journal, which at that time was edited by SEMAL'GAUZER. Such systematic negligence naturally makes doubtful your own position and, I think, it will be very useful for you to be more critical of what people tell you about SIL'YANDER'S work. Perhaps the reports of his statements regarding the respiratory quotient, and of his ignorance in analyzing physiological processes will then appear not credible."

SECRET

SECRET

APPENDIX C

50X1-HUM

I. E. GLUSHCHENKO (p 59-66)Soviet Geneticists

According to this speaker, Soviet genetics and eugenics were from the very beginning in 1922 developed by persons holding suspect and mistaken views. The scientists who emerged from this early school are tainted with the same anti-Marxian tendencies.

FILIPCHENKO founded a "Bureau of Eugenics" in 1922, by which a number of doctrinally unsound papers were published.

KOLTSOV, Associate Member Academy of Sciences USSR., founded the Russian Eugenics Society at about the same time, which developed along similar lines to FILIPCHENKO'S Bureau.

SEKREBROVSKIY, Associate Member Academy of Sciences, a Morganist, supported KOLTSOV'S teaching.

These pseudoscientists are all dead, but their pupils are still with us. They include:

DOBZHANSKIY, FILIPCHENKO'S pupil, who was sent abroad at government expense, and who refused to return.

RAPPOPORT, a militant anti-Michurinist, collaborating with DUBININ.

TIMOFEYEV-RESOVSKIY, who was sent at the state expense to study in Germany, and who refused to return.

PANSHIN, from DUBININ'S laboratory, who was conscripted to the Red Army during the war, and took the first opportunity of deserting to the enemy. He at once wrote to TIMOFEYEV-RESOVSKIY, and became his collaborator; his wife and family were sent from German-occupied Russia to join him in Berlin.

Associate Member Academy of Sciences, DUBININ, who was an uncompromising anti-Michurinist, and is so highly praised by DOBZHANSKIY, DARLINGTON, SACHS, and other reactionaries. He published a paper in the reactionary American Journal Science, in 1946.

Associate Member Academy of Sciences, Vitali Leonidovich RYZKOV, head of the Laboratory of Virology, who pretends to be impartial, but who is in reality more anti- than pro-Michurinist.

Doctor of Biological Sciences, A. A. PROKOF'YEVA-BELGOVSKAYA, whose doctor's thesis, based on pure Mendelism, was accepted by the scientific council of the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology imeni Severtsov, Director, Academy SHMAL'GAUZEN, despite the speaker's protests.

Professor MASHKOVTSIEV, a member of the scientific council, who fully agreed with the speaker, but nevertheless voted for PROKOF'YEVA.

- 11 -

SECRET

SECRET

50X1-HUM

APPENDIX D

RESOLUTIONS OF PRESIDUM OF ACADEMY OF SCIENCES USSR

Academician L. A. OKRELI to be relieved of his duties as Academician-Secretary of the Division of Biological Science; Academician A. I. OPARIN to be the acting Academician-Secretary, pending appointment by the next general meeting. Academician T. D. LYSENKO to be made a member of the Bureau of the Division of Biological Science.

Academician I. I. SHMAL'GAUZEN to be relieved of his duties as Director of the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology imeni A. N. SEVERTSOV.

The activities of the Cytogenetics Laboratory, Institute of Cytology, Histology, and Embryology, under Associate Member of the Academy Prof N. P. DUBININ, to be suspended, as being based on antiscientific principles, and having given no practical results for many years. The Laboratories of Botanical Cytology and of Phenogenesis of the same institute to be abolished, for the same reasons.

The Bureau of the Division of Biological Science to revise the scientific research plan for 1948 - 1950, in accordance with Michurinist doctrine, and in subordination to the needs of national economy.

The publications council of the Division of Biological Science to prepare a scientific biography of Michurin, during 1948 - 1949, for the "scientific classics" series.

To examine the composition of the scientific councils of Biological Institutes, and of the editorial boards of biological journals, to eliminate Weissmanist-Morganist geneticists therefrom, and to replace them with Michurinists.

To entrust the Division of History and Philosophy with the task of producing a theoretical generalized account of the achievements of Michurinism, and a critical account of the pseudoscientific Weissmanist-Morganist movement.

To entrust the Bureau of the Division with the task of reviewing the structure, scientific trends, and personnel of the establishments of the Division, and within a month to submit a project for the reorganization of the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology imeni SEVERTSOV and of the Institute of Cytology, Histology, and Embryology.

The editorial-publication council to submit within a month a plan for assuring the publication in their journals of papers on Michurinist biology.

To arrange for a joint general meeting of the Division of Biological Science in October 1948, together with the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Science imeni LENIN, with the biological establishments of all Republican Academies, and with the branches (filials) and research bases of the Academy of Sciences USSR., to discuss the future development of Michurinist biology.

To entrust the Bureau with the task of reviewing the training plan for aspirants in accordance with Michurinist science.

To publish the proceedings of the Session in the Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR.

- E N D -

- 12 -

SECRET